



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

have been inconceivable two thousand years ago, inconceivable two hundred years ago. It was Christianity that did that. Two thousand years ago the thought was, "Injure your enemy in every possible way." There is not a nation on earth, civilized or semi-civilized, that dreams of warfare in that way to-day. The weapons of war have been changed: poisons are no longer permitted, explosive bullets are not permitted. The treatment of the sick and the wounded has been wonderfully changed; and Clara Barton to-day with the Red Cross goes amid the woes of Armenia or the starvation of Cuba, protected by her Christian womanhood and by the Christian sentiment of nations that are in deadly struggle. Non-combatants are unmolested, the rights of neutrals are respected. And all this has been done under the dominance of Christian teaching.

But we must go still farther. On the frontier, when two men fall out, they organize an extempore court and administer rough justice, hot with passion. In savage life, when two men quarrel, one knocks down his enemy, and there are no rules of the game. Under the old ridiculous "code of honor," paces were measured off, and we had the duel. Under established law those things become impossible. We have an established court, to which the differences of individuals can be referred. Now I affirm that every argument for the reference of differences between individuals to an established court in civilized lands, is an argument that tells a thousand-fold for the establishment of some court of high arbitrament among nations, to which national differences of opinion may be referred, and whose decisions shall be enforced, not by war, but by the high dignity, the evident fairness, the Christian principle, of the court itself.

The ethics of Jesus must be applied to the nations of the world. All nations are in some sense personalities. Each nation has a conscience and a will and a character, which are more than the simple sum of the wills and consciences and characters of the individuals comprising it. If in an individual magnanimity, generosity, forbearance, altruism, love, are admirable, they are a million-fold more admirable in a nation composed of a million men. If courtesy and chivalry are binding on the individual, they are much more binding on a puissant nation. If an individual ought to spring to the relief of a defenceless neighbor by his side, why may not, under Christian principle, a nation do the same thing? If the individual is bound to regard principle more than policy, bound to seek for righteousness more than the rewards of righteousness, bound to seek for justice and truth in his personal and commercial and professional relations, much more are nations bound to do the same thing. And if we who are Christians as individuals, every one of us acknowledging that the standard of Christ is the supreme norm for us,—if now we can say, that is the standard for our home, that is the standard for our village or municipality, that is the standard for our national life, then Christ shall become the Prince of Peace in a wholly new sense, and a fresh song of the angels shall be heard throughout the world.

I believe we can strive for this. Our protection is not to be found in great guns, but in the men behind the guns, in the righteousness and character within the men. Cromwell said to the English soldiers, "You boast of the great ditch that surrounds your island; but let me tell you, your ditch will not save you if you break God's

law!" We need not simply a ditch, not simply our armor-plate in time of danger. We need the protection of the pacific spirit, of the recognition of the brotherhood of nations, of the unity of the race, which shall surely cause every difficulty in time to vanish, every great obstacle in time to dwindle and fade, and shall usher in the time of which William Watson has spoken,

"When, wise from out the foolish past,
Nations shall, peradventure, hail at last
The coming of that morn divine,
When nations shall as forests grow;
Wherein the oak hates not the pine,
Nor beeches wish the cedars woe;
But all in their unlikeness blend
Confederate to one golden end."

Objections to National Wheat Granaries in Great Britain.

A letter of Mr. Edward Atkinson to a leading commercial paper of England.

BOSTON, MASS., June 23, 1898.

To the Editor of

DEAR SIR,—

Many persons have read with interest the various articles recently contributed to the press in England on the danger which the United Kingdom now incurs of a short food supply, especially of a short supply of wheat. The discussion itself brings into very conspicuous notice the interdependence of the English-speaking people. You buy from the United States fifty per cent of all that we export. Our supply of food is as necessary to you as your market is necessary to us, and yet there are a few noisy persons and presses in both countries who have been idiotic enough to promote animosity in the past and who might be so wanting in all that makes a man fit to be respected as to provoke a war between the two great branches of the English-speaking people. I do not use the word Anglo-Saxon for the reason that with a few unimportant exceptions the members of other families among the nations who have found a way to welfare in the United States are as true to the principle of liberty and of common law as if they had not been born under other conditions. There are also people of some eminence and of so little true insight into what really makes nations great as to have led them to treat commerce as if it were a pursuit inferior to that of the army and the navy; or as if armies or navies, especially the latter, would have any reason for their existence in modern times except for the protection of the commerce from which they have been generated and by which they are supported. The sea power now rests on the commerce of which navies are the national police.

We observe that plans are proposed for establishing national granaries in Great Britain in which to store a reserve of wheat, estimated to cost anywhere from fifteen to twenty million sterling,—a singular reversion to the conception of semi-barbaric conditions. Are there not easier and simpler ways to give the people of England positive assurance of the continuous supply of grain from this country, which would rot upon our fields were it not for the British market? Some of these writers are so ill informed as to anticipate a falling off in the supply from the wheat fields of America. It is only necessary to call their attention to the fact that the potential of our wheat lands has hardly been opened. Witness the

fact that part of the Indian Reservation north of Texas opened to settlement under the name of Oklahoma but two or three years ago will this year put into the market about four million quarters or over thirty million bushels of wheat. There is unoccupied land in that immediate neighborhood sufficient for the production of the present entire wheat crop of the United States whenever anybody wants it, and will pay the cost of production and a small profit over.

In the plans for the national granaries on your side it has been suggested to build them of concrete in order to avoid dampness. Why not continue to make use of the ample granaries of our Northwest, where the dry climate gives assurance that the wheat will be well preserved?

But, say the alarmists, the commerce between the United States and Great Britain might be interrupted, first, by other nations, second, by a quarrel among themselves. How shall these objections be met? There is a very simple solution. We proposed in 1856 not only to abolish privateering but to make private property exempt from seizure upon the high seas as it is now upon the land. War upon the land has ceased in some measure to be an opportunity for rapine and plunder conducted under the necessary conditions of the science of war by lying, misleading, ambushing and spying, getting the advantage of the enemy and striking him in the back and other military arts. The latter elements are still necessary to the conduct of war, but rapine and plunder upon the land without compensation, and bombardment of unprotected cities is no longer tolerated. Why not renew that proposal to establish immunity from seizure of private property on the ferry way or sea way between the ports of this country and the ports of Europe under the supervision of an international police consisting of the navies of both countries? If the other nations did not choose to join they could remain out at their peril. The navies of the United States and Great Britain combined are sufficient to maintain peace, order and progress over the sea way, which must necessarily be kept open for the mutual benefit of the English-speaking people.

But, says an objector, "Suppose there is a falling out between Great Britain and the United States." Well suppose there is. That could only be brought about by the reprehensible conduct of small people commonly called jingoes who might happen to have been put in places of responsibility. We have had and have now some examples of this type of irresponsible people in the Senate of the United States and there has been a suspicion on this side that some members of a similar class had even secured position in your Parliament and even in your cabinet. We can provide both against them and for them and we can also provide opportunities for officers of the navy and authors who treat of the naval power as the chief consideration to continue the development of the fighting qualities which are considered by them so necessary to national existence. A little common sense put in a treaty will provide an arena at some place on the ocean where a sea fight would do no harm to anyone except those who took part in it. It might then be arranged that in case the jingoes of the two countries had come into collision a certain part of the naval force not required for the preservation of order might be sent out on each side and have it out and see which could mislead, deceive or get the better of the other. On this fleet the men who had not sufficient common sense to keep the

peace might leave their legislative halls or respective cabinets and take their places on the ships of war for such service as they might be competent to render. It would take no more brain power to shovel coal into the furnace or to serve in binding up wounds in the ward room than it had taken to get into the difficulty which had made a fight of some sort necessary. Of course these men would not be competent to do the technical work of managing the ship any more than they have proved to be competent to do the technical work of managing the government, and would therefore be put into inferior positions.

I venture to submit this plan as a better one for assuring the food supply of the British branch of the English-speaking people than the one of wasting fifteen or twenty million pounds sterling in building silo granaries so-called, of concrete, wholly unfit for the preservation of wheat in a climate which is not as well suited for keeping grain dry as that in which the grain is now produced. I think my plan may perhaps be accepted as the more sensible of the two.

The Failure of Militarism.

BY J. W. LEEDS.

Just before the outbreak of the war with Spain, I sent to the *ADVOCATE*, with approving comment, an editorial from that newly launched daily reform paper, *The Commonwealth* of Harrisburg, Penn., which characterized in appropriate terms the folly of engagement in war, declared against the jingo spirit, so prevalent, and contended that the methods of peace should suffice to resolve our difficulties. When the strife was entered upon, however, the popular demand to "Remember the Maine" and to keep up the fight to a finish, was seemingly fully endorsed, and the words that should make for peace and goodwill to men were forgotten or remained unspoken. In the issue of yesterday, nevertheless, there appeared an editorial under the caption heading this article, so assertive of the truth about "the wretched business" that it may be profitable to pass it on as an encouragement to some others to honestly speak out what is in their "heart of hearts" concerning "the rowdy's way of settling a difficulty."

Following is the first part of the aforesaid editorial:

"No matter how justifiable this Spanish war may be, or what excuses we pile up for being in the wretched business, how we glorify the heroism of warfare, or how devoted in our worship of Mars, the real bedrock truth stripped of all glamor is that it is the rowdy's way of settling a difficulty. Be it ever so true that Spain is a semi-barbarous nation and that we could not avoid getting into the miserable mess, it is none the less deplorable from every point of view. And not the least is the retrogressive effect it has upon the present generation of children. It is pitiable to see them everywhere in the mimic panoply of warfare, playing battle, and feeding their young imaginations with reports of strife, fighting and killing. To some minds this passes for patriotism. It is easily conceivable how a gentleman might get into a personal row with a rowdy. Under circumstances of sufficient provocation it might become his duty to fight in defence of the weak, the injured, or the innocent, or in self-defence against the attack of the thug who tries to carry everything with the bludgeon. There are persons